



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/862,826

05/22/2001

Isao Takeuchi

SONYJP 3.0-783

8870

530 7590 04/02/2008
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER

SHANG, ANNAN Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/02/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 01/28/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claims 1 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Igarashi et al (5,940,143)**, applicant discusses the claim limitations and the prior art of record and argues that, the prior art of record does not teach the claim limitation, i.e., "...an interference signal having a carrier frequency of a highest peak level, the interference signal mixed in the frequency bandwidth of said channel..."(see page 4+ of Applicant's Remarks)

In response, Examiner disagrees. Examiner notes applicant's arguments; however, Igarashi discloses suppressing inference mixed in the frequency bandwidth of the channel. Igarashi discloses that interference in the channel as a result of specific terrain of during a specific weather change (col.3, lines 64-67) and also interference which may be cause by the peripheral elements within the receiver. Igarashi teaches that the channel received at the receiver is mixed with interference signal and discloses a Limiter-180, which dynamically adjusts interference of a peak level or threshold and a PLL/Controller 130/220, which phase locks to the interference signal of the peak level and feeds the signal to a level adjuster IFAGC-100 as illustrated by the feedback loops (figs.1-3 and in col.7, lines 1-52, col.8, lines 30-40, col.9, lines 48-65 and col.11, lines 35+). Igarashi further discloses interference may occur between channels caused by broadcast having different levels such as high-definition TV signal and standard TV

signals transmitted simultaneously and also as a result of the peripheral elements within the receiver, when a desired channel is selected (col.3, line 64-67, col.6, line 22-27 and col.11, lines 35-52). Hence Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The 102(b) rejection is proper, meets all the claim limitations and maintained as discussed below.

This office action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Igarashi et al (5,940,143)**

As to claim 1, note the Igarashi reference figures 1-3, disclose high-definition TV signal receiving apparatus and gain control circuit and further discloses an interference reducing circuit comprising:

Receiving means (NTSC Receiver, col.5, lines 5, lines 3-17 and lines 44-58) which includes a signal processing circuit for tuning and demodulating a reception signal of a frequency bandwidth of a channel with interference signal having a carrier frequency of a highest peak level, the interference signal mixed in the frequency

bandwidth of the same channel (col.3, line 64-67, col.5, line 58-col.6, line 6, line 22-27 and col.11, lines 35-52);

Phase locking means (PLL/Controller 'PLL/C' 130/220) for attaining phase locking the interference signal of the highest peak level (col.5, lines 18-22 and col.6, lines 7-15), note Igarashi discloses a Limiter-180, which adjust the interference of a peak level or threshold (col.5, lines 23-35, col.6, lines 31-42, col.7, lines 1-52, col.8, lines 30-40, col.9, lines 48-65 and col.11, lines 35+)

Level adjusting means (IFAGC-100, col.7, line 53-col.8, line 6) for adjusting a level of a phase-locked signal that is output from the phase locking means to be equal to a level of the interference signal (col.8, lines 7-67 and col.10, line 60-col.11, line 52) and subtracted means (AGC Detector 200) for subtracting the level-adjusted phase-locked signal of the reception means (col.7, lines 31-63), note that besides suppressing interference between channels caused by broadcast having different levels such as high-definition TV signal and standard TV signals transmitted simultaneously, Igarashi further discloses suppressing interference in the same channel as a result of specific terrain of during a specific weather change and also interference cause by the peripheral elements within the receiver, when a desired channel is selected.

As to claim 4, Igarashi further discloses where the interference signal has an amplitude-modulated or frequency-modulated carrier and where a loop characteristic of the PLL means is set so as to follow the amplitude-modulated carrier or the frequency-modulated carrier (col.5, lines 36-65 and col.8, lines 6-40 and col.11, lines 35-52).

As to claim 5, the claimed “a TV broadcasting receiver, comprising...” is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 1 above.

Claim 6 is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 4.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Annan Q. Shang** whose telephone number is **571-272-7355**. The examiner can normally be reached on **700am-400pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Christopher S. Kelley** can be reached on **571-272-7331**. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2623

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the **Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)**. If you would like assistance from a **USPTO Customer Service Representative or access** to the automated information system, **call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000**.

/Annan Q Shang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2623

Annan Q. Shang